

STOC II Draft RFP (W900KK-08-R-0001)
Questions & Answers

Note: Questions 1-99 have already been posted in previous sets of Q&As.

100. Does the government plan to provide (a) required education and (b) years of experience to each of the Labor Categories? These elements are required in order to be specific in pricing. An Electronics Engineer with 10 years of experience and a Master's Degree demands a significantly higher salary than a first year engineer. Would you prefer that we cost out the very basic "no experience" level for the proposal?

The Final RFP will include experience and education requirements for all labor categories provided in Attachment 4.

101. The latest draft RFP focuses on the ability to provide for both products and services. At present, however, the labor categories identified are more applicable to the development of systems or products than providing services support. Will additional labor categories be provided inclusive of performing services work under the STOC II IDIQ? This would enable companies to better tailor their proposals and related costs to the specific product or service desired by PEO STRI's customers.

No, additional labor categories will not be added to the RFP. However, as specified in Section B.4 of the RFP, additional labor categories may be negotiated at the delivery/task order level as needed for the particular requirement.

102. The latest draft RFP requests offerors to discuss past performance in terms of front end analysis, design, development, fielding, and sustainment. These activities more directly pertain to product development than to the creation and providing of services. Will these past performance activities/areas be adjusted to better focus on services support?

No. The 5 functional areas apply as business processes to both products and services. Services require a contractor to apply the same business processes in the 5 functional areas.

103. SOW Paragraph 3.3.1 requires the Contractor to "provide real-time, reliable and user-friendly electronic remote access to all appropriate data produced under the contract. . . ." Question: Does this requirement apply to classified data or only to unclassified data?

Unclassified data.

104. Is it the Government's intent to award separate contracts, under each LOT (Full and Small Business), for each of the 5 functional areas – FEA, Design, Development, Fielding, and Sustainment?

No. Awards will be made by Lot (Full & Open Lot; Small Business Set-Aside Lot), not by functional area.

Or to be awarded a prime contract for either the Full or Small Business LOT the offeror must provide demonstrated past performance in all 5 functional areas?

Yes. Offerors' proposals will be required to demonstrate the contractor's business processes in the five functional areas.

105. Reference Section C.2; The RFP states, "The contractor shall be responsible for employing qualified management, technical, and support personnel to perform tasks as set forth in the basic Indefinite Delivery/ Indefinite Quantity Contract (ID/IQC) PBWS and "

The Revised Draft-RFP has no PBWS identified. Should the reference be to the SOW rather than PBWS?

Yes.

106. Section H.21 states - In addition, the Government's subcontracting goals (for all large businesses and those small businesses that subcontract) by Socio-economic category are as follows:

CATEGORY	GOAL (percentage of subcontracted dollars)
Small Disadvantaged Business	7%
Woman Owned Small Business	5%
Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business	3%
HUBZone Small Business	3%

Sections L.7.1 and M.3.4 lists the following Small Business categories: Small Business, Small Disadvantaged Business, Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business, Veteran-Owned Small Business, Woman-Owned Small Business, HUBZones, and Historically Black Colleges/Universities and Minority Institutions.

Does the Government have percentage goals for the categories not identified in Section H.21?

No. It is up to the Offeror to provide percentage goals for those categories.

107. Section M.1.5 states, "The Government may judge a proposal to be unacceptable if the proposal will provide a particular feature or training objective without explaining how it will meet the feature or objective , or statements such as "we will use best commercial practices," "we will use standard procedures," or "we will employ well-known techniques," if the Offeror uses such terms without definition or explanation."

Is this Evaluation Criterion still valid since there is no longer a requirement for a Technical Proposal Volume?

Yes. However, the Government will revise to make it appropriately relevant in the Final RFP.

108. In Section 3.0, under the SMALL BUSINESS SET-ASIDE LOT heading it states, "Management Subfactors in Section 3.2.2 are listed in descending order of importance. Subcontractor Management Plan is more important than Management Plan. Management Plan is more important than Quality Assurance Plan."

Should the reference be to Section 3.1.2 rather than Section 3.2.2? There is no Section 3.2.2

Yes.

109. The sentence ‘Performance Risk Rating Definitions are listed in the Performance Risk Rating Chart in Section M.4.2.’ appears twice in Section M.3.2.

Should the second accordance be deleted or should one of the sentences be modified to make reference to something different?

It is a duplicate. The Government will delete one in the Final RFP.

110. There is no reference made to Section 4.1 in the revised draft RFP.

Does the information in this section still apply to the evaluation process? It could still apply to Management and Small Business Participation Plan, but no references have been made to it in Sections M.3.3 or M.3.4.

M.4.1 applies to both M.3.3 and M.3.4. The Government will revise the Final RFP to reflect this.

111. Paragraph B.1 conveys that the Contract Line Item Numbers (CLIN) listed in the schedule may be used for FFP, CPFF, CPAF, T&M delivery/task orders issued under the contract. However, the CLIN structure depicted in the schedule shows “Performance of work in accordance with FFP...” Does this mean these specific CLINs are FFP? Or is this entry simply a procurement automated system default entry that is automatically entered if there is no input from the Contract Specialist? Please clarify.

The Government has labeled the CLINs as FFP for administrative purposes only (see Section B.2).

112. Paragraph H.21 Small Business participation states, “All awardees in the Full & Open LOT (both large businesses and small businesses) will be responsible for meeting the Small Business Participation goal of no less than 15% of the total cost of performance, exclusive of profit, of all delivery/task orders awarded under this ID/IQC during each ordering period of the contract.”

This has been interpreted to mean that Full & Open ID/IQC winners must meet or exceed the 15% small business goal on each delivery order/task order in any given ordering period. There may be some delivery orders/task orders that are small or do not necessitate that a prime contractor subcontract any of the work in order to satisfy delivery order/task order requirements for products or services on schedule and with in cost, and with exceptional performance.

Therefore, will the Government consider rewording this sentence in H.21 to be “All awardees in the Full & Open LOT (both large businesses and small businesses) will establish a Small Business Participation goal of no less than 15% of the total cost of performance, exclusive of profit, for the sum of all delivery/task orders awarded under this ID/IQC during each ordering period of the contract.”

This will require the prime contractor to actively manage small business participation for the duration of the ordering period to both meet the goal and ensure very low risk of successfully delivering superior products and services on schedule and with in costs.

The Small Business Participation goal does not apply to specific DO/TOs, but rather the total funded amount received over the entire ordering period.

The Government will revise Section H.21, in part, to read as follows:

“All awardees in the Full & Open LOT (both large businesses and small businesses) will be responsible for meeting the Small Business Participation goal of no less than 15% of the total funded amount of all delivery/task orders awarded under this ID/IQC during each ordering period of the contract.”

113. Section L.8.1 states, “The Offerors shall complete the Cost/Price Format Spreadsheet provided as Attachment (6) of the RFP for the three-year base period and for the option year ordering periods. The Government intends to incorporate only those rates for the three-year base period into the resultant IDIQ contract and use those rates to price resultant T&M type task orders unless otherwise negotiated downwards.”

Section B.4 states, “They are the sole labor rates allowable for all Prime contractor labor hours billable for T&M delivery/task orders.”

In combination, these two sections indicate that only the Prime contractor labor rates will be used for T&M type delivery orders/task orders and they can only be negotiated downward. Until specific delivery order/task order request for proposals are issued and the appropriate teams are assembled, it will not be possible to know if the Prime contractor labor rates will be adequate for all work to be performed. For example, if a delivery order/task order is issued that requires some very specialized, senior expertise and it is determined that a subcontractor will be required to provide this capability, the labor rate from the subcontractor could be higher than the Prime contractor rate.

Therefore, will the Government consider changing the wording of L.8.1 to read “The Offerors shall complete the Cost/Price Format Spreadsheet provided as Attachment (6) of the RFP for the three-year base period and for the option year ordering periods. The Government intends to incorporate only those rates for the three-year base period into the resultant IDIQ contract and use those rates to price resultant T&M type task orders unless otherwise negotiated. T&M rates for subcontractors will be negotiated at the delivery order/task order level, as applicable.”

The additional sentence added to L.8.1 is based on the response to questions on the original STOC II Draft-RFP.

Yes. The Government will revise the language in the Final RFP.

114. Section L.7.2 states, “.....all awardees (both large businesses and small businesses) in the Full & Open LOT will be responsible for meeting the Government’s Small Business Participation goal of not less than 15% of the total cost of performance, exclusive of profit, of all delivery/task orders awarded under this ID/IQC during each ordering period and over the life of the contract.”

I interpret this to mean that the small business participation plan percentages have to be met on each deliver/task order over each ordering period as well as over the life of the contract. Is the correct?

No. See question #112.

115. The Attachment 6 Cost Price Worksheet template does not include a place to enter cost of money factors. How should this be handled? It is recommended that the template be modified to include cells for entering cost of money factors.

The Government will add a Cost of money column in Attachment 6.

116. The Cost/Price Worksheet includes a column for entering fringe rates. If the contractor's overhead has the fringe rolled into it, is it acceptable to leave the fringe column blank and provide fringe information separately if required?

Yes.

117. Does the cover page count towards the page count of each volume?

No.

118. Paragraph H.26(c)(4) states that "...contractor's invoices shall include receipts or other evidence substantiating actual costs incurred for authorized travel." In order to streamline and optimize the invoice submittal, review and approval process, recommend the contractor be directed to retain rather than submit receipts and other evidence substantiating actual costs and submit the supporting documentation on a case by case basis if requested. Any travel costs invoiced that appear not to be compliant with the Joint Travel Regulations can be challenged and at that time, the contractor can submit the supporting documentation. Moreover, DCAA has access to contractor records supporting this contract at any time so retaining documents, receipts, et al to substantiate travel costs is a must for the contractor. Therefore, recommend the aforementioned subparagraph (4) be restated to read: "The contractor's invoice shall ***be supported by*** receipts or other evidence substantiating actual costs incurred for authorized travel *and retained at the contractor's location unless requested for a specific invoice.*"

No.

119. The Government has referenced the Service Contract Act (SCA) in the contract clauses. We could not locate the Wage Determination but read in Section 1.7 of the draft RFP that the Wage Determination is not part of the RFP but would be completed as applicable on individual Delivery Orders. Thus, this can be interpreted as Wage Determination is applicable only on individual Delivery Orders for employees subject to SCA. Is this interpretation correct? Would it also be correct that deriving T&M rates for the draft IDIQ does not require use of SCA labor rates per Attachment 6?

Yes, Wage Determination, if applicable, will be addressed at the DO/TO level.

Correct, T&M rates for the IDIQ do not require use of Service Contract Act (SCA) labor rates.

120. Will there be an expansion of the description of the labor categories? The current labor categories listed in Attachment 4 appear to be a combination of the Duties and Responsibilities listed in the Labor Categories from the 11-14-07 draft. Also, there are no Education requirements listed in the current release.

See question #100.

121. On page 109 of the RFP, on the note under L.7.2 it states “Large Business Offerors shall not submit a Subcontracting Plan as required by the FAR clause 52.219-9 with the proposal”. We interpret this to mean that ONLY a Small Business Participation Plan will be submitted as described in L.7.1 and L.7.2. Is this correct?

Yes.

Since no Subcontracting Plan is required; we plan to address percentage goals for the various types of small business for at least 15% of total cost of estimated performance allocated by type of small business. Is this correct?

The Small Business Participation Plan shall include your overall Small Business participation goals along with your subcontracting goals for each socio-economic category listed in Section L.7.1.

The semi-annual small business participation report form shown on attachment 5 of the RFP includes HBCU/MI; should we include HBCU/MI in our Participation Plan?

Yes.

The semi-annual small business participation report form includes large business concerns. Should we include large business percentages on our Small Business Participation Plan?

No.

122. In the draft RFP Section H.21, paragraph 3, the sample calculations of subcontracting goals are clear. However, Attachment 5, small business participation form, includes formulas for calculating the socio-economic subcontracting results that do not match the example outlined in Section H.21. Using the H.21 example the small disadvantage business goal would be $(\$150,000 \times 7\% = \$10,500)$, by comparison if the \$10,500 is entered into the worksheet along with the other figures in the example the resulting percentage is 1.05%. We assume that the calculations explained in Section H.21 are correct and we are to base our Goals on those calculations, we also recommend that the calculations in Attachment 5 be changed to match the example. This would support a direct comparison of actuals to the goals submitted.

The Government will revise Attachment 5 in the Final RFP.

123. The labor hour and category distributions are consistent with prime contractor management of Task Orders - is there a particular execution or source selection philosophy that drove this distribution or is there another consideration?

The intent of the labor category selection was to select those categories most representative of work expected under STOC II. The initial baseline for labor categories was the original STOC I document RFP. The STOC II team compared that baseline to the labor categories in the PEO STRI SETA contract and revised it where applicable (i.e., the team added positions that were pertinent to the STOC II SOW; deleted those that were only germane to SETA work; reworded the added labor category descriptions to make them applicable to the STOC II SOW). The STOC II team staffed the revised list among the PMs and the PEO major directorates for comment and additions/deletions. The team added/deleted several positions, with the PMs providing labor category descriptions for the added labor categories. The PEO posted the labor categories in

draft form on its website and has made revisions to the labor categories based upon questions and input from Industry.

The STOC II team based the labor hour distribution upon a set amount of dollars for a given execution year (from the Government's Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE)). The team made a reasonable distribution of hours in each labor category against a theoretical* average funding amount for each company in a given year. Attachment 6 to the RFP holds these labor hour distributions constant relative to one another throughout each year of the 10 year estimate.

* Theoretical in the sense the funding allocation is only for cost/price reasonableness evaluations in the context of the STOC II RFP. It is not intended to be representative of any company's expected, probable or potential work effort in any given year or over the life of the contract.

124. Section L.8.1. states that Offerors shall complete the Cost/Price Format Spreadsheet provided as Attachment (6) of the RFP for the three-year base period and for the option year ordering periods. Is each offeror required to provide rates for every labor category?

Yes.

If so, for labor categories that are not part of the offeror's core business, do we map the closest equivalent labor category, within our core competencies?

The Government will remove the Column in the Cost/Price Spreadsheet that requires the Offerors to state their equivalent labor category.

125. Will the evaluation of the offeror's cost be primarily based on the bottom line of the total cost for all labor categories, including estimated manhours?

If not on the bottom line, will the cost evaluation be primarily focused on management cost and other costs most applicable to the offeror's core competency?

See Section M.3.5.1.2.

126. There are five sub-categories (L.8.1 – L.8.2 – L.8.3 – L.8.4 – L.8.5) in the Cost/Price Volume (L.8.0). How are those sub-categories weighted for relative order of importance, in the cost/price evaluation?

These paragraphs provide an Offeror instructions on what is to be included in the Cost/Price volume so the Government may evaluate its content. They are not sub-categories/subfactors, therefore they are not weighted.

127. The table in H.21 indicates that the subcontracting goals by socio-economic category is "Percentage of Subcontracted Dollars," but the example given would indicate that these goals are "Percentage of Small Business Subcontracted Dollars." For clarification purposes, recommend that the column title on the table be changed to "Percentage of Small Business Subcontracted Dollars."

The column title on the table is correct. The Government will modify the narrative explanation to more clearly explain the intent.

128. Since the Government has established the labor mix for bidding purposes and we are required elsewhere in L.8.2 to explain the basis for our fully loaded labor rates, what is to be provided in response to “basis of estimate.”

For “basis of estimate,” the Offeror shall explain the method for determining the direct labor rate, e.g., DCMA approved labor rates, comparable established labor categories, salary/labor websites.

129. Section M.3.5.1.2 and the cost spreadsheet refer to travel and material being fixed amounts; however, Section L.8.0 does not make mention of this. For clarification, we suggest that Section L.8.0 be revised to include this information.

The Government will revise in the Final RFP.

130. In Section B.4, do you want Government Site Labor Rates as well as Contractor Site?

No, only Contractor Site rates.

131. Some confusion has arisen over the most appropriate way to approach bidding LOT 1. We previously understood that PEO STRI would prefer to have large companies bid all 13 Product Areas. However, more recently we understand that PEO STRI would rather have companies target areas that they are extremely well qualified in versus attempting to target all areas at once.

If possible can you clarify your desires with respect to this question?

The Government will not make awards by Product Areas. Offerors’ proposals will be required to demonstrate the contractor’s business processes in the five functional areas per Section L.5.1. See revised Draft RFP.

132. Will the Government consider adding another set-aside Lot for Service Disabled Veteran Small Business (SDVOSB)?

No. There will not be a separate Lot for SDVOSB. However, the Government will include language in the Final RFP that reserves the right to set aside DO/TOs for SDVOSB within the Small Business Set Aside Lot in order to meet socio-economic goals.

133. Section L.8.2. of the RFP indicates that the offeror must enter an equivalent labor category for each Government labor category in Attachment 6, along with the corresponding hourly rate. What is an offeror expected to do if it has no labor category corresponding to a listed Government category? Specific examples include Engineer, Microwave; Engineer, Nuclear; and Scientist, Chemical or Biological. Not all qualified offerors (particularly small businesses) will have qualifications or personnel in these areas (or any desire for such, as they may lay outside the business’ core capabilities).

In this case, the Offeror shall provide rationale in the supporting documentation to accompany the Cost/Price volume that explains the basis of estimate for each labor category. Also see question #128.

134. “Specialist, Command Training”, is listed in B.4 but not included in the Labor Category Descriptions, Attachment 4. Should it be included in the Descriptions or should it be removed from B.4?

The Government will revise the Final RFP to remove this labor category from B.4.

135. Per Item #1 in Attachment #6, the instructions for completing the cost/price worksheet. "Offerors shall provide information for all areas in the spreadsheet highlighted in yellow." Since it is known that multiple awards will be made to large and small businesses and that each offeror is expected to have different capabilities, which may not include personnel for every labor category, does every labor category need to complete by all offerors?

Yes.

136. Is paragraph L.6.3.3.2 supposed to be numbered as L.6.1.3.2?

Yes. The Government will correct in the Final RFP.

137. Will small businesses solely receiving an award in the Set-Aside LOT have direct access to view the task order solicitations for the Full and Open LOT?

Yes. The Government will communicate all DO/TO opportunities via the PEO STRI Business Opportunities Portal.

138. Can you provide more information on the processes and procedures by which task order solicitations will be issued?

The general ordering procedures will be included in the Final RFP. The Government will tailor these procedures on a DO/TO specific basis, as applicable.

139. How will the Government evaluate a small business plan if specific subcontractors are not included? Will plans that do or do not identify specific companies be penalized?

The Government will evaluate Volume III – Small Business Participation Plan IAW M.3.4. No penalty will be assessed for not identifying specific companies.

140. Will the Government use a software tool to evaluate proposals? If so, what tool?

At this time, the Government has not made this determination.

141. What percentage of the work under STOC II do you anticipate as product services, IT services, program management services, and training?

STOC II will be predominantly a Products based ID/IQ contract. The Government will not commit to a specific percentage at this time.

142. The instructions sheet for the Cost Price Spread sheet may have an error in the reference to cells. Shouldn't the instructions read as follows:

c: In cells D71-D75, the offeror shall provide the applicable rates (in %) for the specified year. Rates provided in this section will automatically populate applicable areas of the spreadsheet.

d: In cell N72, the offeror shall provide the G&A rate applicable to material. If the offeror's rate structure is such that G&A is not applicable to material, enter 0%.

The Government will correct in Final RFP.

143. Is there a plan to recompetete for new STOC II awards after the base period is complete?

No. However, see question #92.

144. Does the government know how many awards it expects to make under STOCII?

See Clause 5152.216-5008 in Section L.

145. What is the criteria to be used in exercising options?

There is not a predefined set of criteria that the Government will use to exercise option periods. However, the Government will make a critical assessment based on the Offeror's accomplishment of Small Business Participation and Subcontracting goals in accordance with Section H.21. Other areas of consideration may include past performance on orders received, eligibility for Government contracts, and any other area the Government deems appropriate.

146. Reference Section H.7; is it the intent of the Government for the Contractor to have the Associate Contractor Agreement with the LCCS contractor(s) at the prime contract or delivery/task order level? Please clarify.

Associate Contractor Agreements will be applicable at the DO/TO level.

147. Reference Section I – FAR Clause 52.230-1, 52.230-3, 52.230-6; the RFP requires conformance to contractor established disclosures and Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) subject to audit of the proposal. The RFP specified Microsoft Excel spreadsheets do not properly reflect the contractor's applicable and allocable direct cost and indirect burdens and computations. Please confirm the contractor can modify the MSEXcel spreadsheets to conform with disclosed accounting and estimating practices.

An Offeror may submit an alternate spreadsheet that depicts proper application of their indirect rates only if the application differs from that provided in Attachment 6.

148. The subcontracting goals stated in H.21 excludes Historically Black College/Universities and Minority Institutions; however Volume III must address all socio-economic categories with a stated goal and will be evaluated accordingly. Please clarify.

Offerors must address proposed goals for HBCU/MIs in Volume III. The Government does not have a specific subcontracting goal percentage for HBCU/MIs.

149. In Section L.1.6 it states "Any references to sources not provided with an Offeror's proposal will not be considered."

Please clarify if a referenced source is provided as an attachment to any Volume, does it count toward the page limitations?

Yes. Attachments to any Volume will count towards that Volume's overall page count.

150. In the answer to question #20 it was stated that it is a requirement of the Basic ID/IQ award to have a facility clearance level of Secret.

FAR 52.204-2 is incorporated by reference in Section I of the STOC II draft RFP. This clause references the DoD 5220.22-M the *National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual*, which states in paragraph 2-100:

“Contract award may be made prior to issuance of an FCL. In those cases, the contractor will be processed for an FCL at the appropriate level and must meet eligibility requirements for access to classified information.”

Please confirm that an award on the Basic ID/IQ will not be based on the possession of a FCL by the offeror prior to or at time of award.

Correct. See question #99.

151. Section M.3.5.1.2 describes the “total evaluated price” to be the proposed unit price for each labor category , multiplied by the estimated hours provided in Attachment (6), along with the burdened travel and material costs.

We know it is the intent of the Government to award Small Businesses a portion of the ID/IQ procurement; however, most small businesses will not have all listed labor categories approved through DCAA.

- a. Is it the intent of the Government to have all Offeror’s provide rates for all labor categories?

Yes.

- b. How will the Government evaluate proposals from Offerors that do not have all labor categories approved by DCAA?

See Section M.3.5. The Government does not require Offerors to have DCAA approved labor rates for the labor categories.

152. Can the format and formulas in Attachment 6 be changed to accommodate a company’s overhead structure? May the contractor manipulate the spreadsheet and formula in the spreadsheet accordingly?

See question #147.

153. Will the Labor Category descriptions in the final RFP contain minimum and maximum education and experience requirements? The description for the labor categories currently includes only a list of duties.

See question #100.

154. Regarding Section L.5.0., how should offerors handle the use of a teaming partner for certain capabilities in their proposals since teaming at the IDIQ level is not encouraged.

The Government supports teaming when the Prime assesses a need for teaming partners in order to provide a best value response in meeting the requirements of the RFP.

155. Please provide more detailed explanation on what PEO STRI will consider “a lack of past performance record?” when reviewing Factor 1 – Past Performance.

[See Performance Adjectival Rating Schemes, Section M.4.2.](#)

156. We desire to utilize small businesses in many different categories yet may not fulfill the minimum targets in each category. What are PEO-STRI’s expectations regarding vendors subcontracting to each socio-economic category identified in this section? Will PEO STRI expect each vendor to maintain at least the minimum target percent utilization for each category or will there be STOC II subcontractor category utilization tracked by PEO STRI and the vendors may vary from the minimum utilization targets

[The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s Small Business Participation Plan IAW the criteria stated in Section M.3.4. The Government’s intent is to use Attachment 5 to track Small Business Participation Reporting/Socio-economic subcontracting goals. Per Section H.21, awardees are cautioned that failure to demonstrate a good-faith effort to meet the overall Small Business Participation goal and individual Socio-economic subcontracting goals during the base ordering period and/or Option ordering periods may affect past performance assessments in future delivery/task orders and could result in the Government’s unilateral decision to not exercise Option year ordering periods.](#)

157. Pertaining to Section L.5.1, what emphasis is placed on specific "modeling and simulation" past performance in terms of being part of large M&S programs (FCS, FFW, STOC I) rather than non-M&S programs which may be comparable in complexity (technical, management, deliveries, sustainment)?

[The Government will assess Offerors’ Past Performance against a probability of success in performing work specific to the SOW requirements.](#)

158. Are vendors prohibited from submitting a proposal as prime and being submitted as a subcontractor on another STOC II prime’s proposal?

[No.](#)

159. If contracts in the Past Performance Volume can either be comprehensive and address all functional areas or can address on only one functional area and not all SOW paragraphs, how does the Government know that the contractor has addressed all the SOW requirements?

[See question #47.](#)

160. Past Performance-The revised draft SOW has five overarching functional areas listed in 3.0 Requirements. They are also repeated in the SOW as subparagraphs under 3.1.3, Systems Engineering and 3.5 Interim Contractor Support. For Past Performance response, does the contractor check the Functional Area boxes on the Performance Information sheet, Table L-3 and then answer the SOW requirement details in the text response?

[The Offeror is to check the applicable box\(es\) in Table L-3 and ensure their text response addresses parts G-L that follow.](#)

161. Under 3.0 Requirements in the SOW there is a statement, “The requirements are applicable to the Product Areas described within Appendix A1.”

Is the information in Appendix A1 provided for Contractor information or does the contractor need to include this in the Past Performance response?

Appendix A1 is provided to identify the types of work that may be required by PEO STRI during the life of the STOC II contract.

162. According to DFARS 252.216-7002, Alternate A, (effective 2/12/2007): all competitively awarded DoD T&M/LH contracts are required to include separate hourly rates by labor category for the prime contractor, each subcontractor, and each division, subsidiary and affiliate of the contractor under a common control. Blended rates are not permissible on DoD noncommercial contracts. Due to divisional rate differences within one company, can the prime contractor attribute a portion of the Government's estimated hours to different rates for the same category within the same company?

Yes. In such case, an offeror should complete and submit an alternate version of the Cost/Price worksheet. The offeror shall allocate the total hours provided for each labor category equally across each fully burdened T&M rate for that labor category. The offeror shall ensure that the total hours for each labor category match the hours provided by the Government in Attachment 6.

The referenced DFARS clause will be included in the Final RFP.

163. a. The 1st paragraph of L.3.1 states: "Offerors shall submit their written proposal in Microsoft Word 2003 format, *indexed* and" Does PEO STRI require proposals to include a formal index?

The Government will delete the term "indexed" from the Final RFP.

b. With regards to the requirement that "[t]he Offeror shall create a Table of Contents using the Table of Contents feature in MS Word," the MS Word Table of Contents feature will not pick up the contents of MS Excel files, which are used/required in the Cost/Price Volume, and will not pick up contents from other sections of a volume (that may be done in MS Excel, etc.). Please provide guidance on how to handle those instances. May we generate a Table of Contents that is not generated automatically in MS Word to alleviate issues such as these?

Yes.

(c) Are 11" x 17" foldouts allowed?

Yes. See question #60.

164. If the contractor's proposed approach requires multiple cost centers for the same labor category, how should they be handled in the cost/price worksheet?

See question #162.

165. Section L.5.0 requires contractors to discuss current management processes, and section L.6.0 requires discussion and details on the tailored processes used in five programs for five different phases. In which section/volume can contractors discuss the untailored development processes which will be utilized specifically and uniquely on STOC II?

L.5.0 is past performance, not management processes. L.6.0 is management processes and procedures. Information on “where” to “discuss the untailored development processes which will be utilized specifically and uniquely on STOC II” for past performance and for management processes is up to the Offeror.

166. Reference Table L-3, item: D. Period of Performance:

1. Original Date:
2. Current Scheduled Date (if Applicable):

In Table L-3, item D.1 Original Date and D.2 Current Scheduled Date. Are these items referring to the original “end” date of the contract as well as the current scheduled “end” date (if it has changed from the original?)

Yes.

167. Clause 5152.209-5005 requires all offerors to address potential Organizational Conflict Of Interest resulting from performance of the Performance Work Statement with an avoidance / mitigation plan in advance of proposal submission. Given the broad nature of the potential orders suggest this requirement be focused at the Delivery Order / Task Order level.

No, the requirements of this clause will remain as is.

168. How and in which volume will an offerer’s solution for satisfaction of SOW technical requirements be evaluated?

The Government does not have a technical evaluation factor. Offeror’s are required to provide past performance and management proposals in accordance with sections L.5.0 and L.6.0. There are no RFP requirements for “solutions for SOW technical requirements.” See question #165.

169. Is the intent of the government to have each task order required to fulfill the small business goals as set forth in H.21 of the solicitation, or is it meant to fulfill the goals over the life of the STOC II contract?

See question #112.

170. The original Labor Category descriptions have education levels or years of experience associated with each. The new draft has taken these qualifications out. Is it the intent of the government to have all labor categories priced at entry level positions due to the ambiguity in education and experience?

The Final RFP will include experience and education requirements for all labor categories.

171. Instructions in L.5.0 seem to imply that the government is only interested in seeing past performance citations from the prime contractor. Yet Table L-3 item A asks for “Company Name (Company/Division/Team Member)”.

Does the government desire past performance citations from the Prime only?

It is the Offeror’s decision whether to use subcontractors in their Past Performance submissions.

Are Past Performance citations from major subcontractors and team members required?

No.

172. May we include an acronym list in Volumes I-III that are not included in the page count of the Volume?

Acronym Lists may be included, however they will count towards the page count for each Volume.

173. Will the Government allow companies to discount one or more of the Time and Material (T&M) labor rates bid under this solicitation (ref. Attachment 6 – cost price worksheet) when competing for T&M delivery/task orders?

Yes.

174. The draft RFP states that the proposal shall be valid for not less than 240 calendar days. That is much longer than expectations for many teaming agreements. Given that the current acquisition calendar does not estimate proposals due until late March at the earliest and contract award will be in September, can this period be reduced to 180 days?

No.

175. The Statement of Work appears historically bound to single point solution products. It appears to define Services” as “Support Systems” and does not represent the full scale and scope of potential PEO STRI solutions to meet the expanded set of services and products required to support the anticipated customer base. It is specifically lacking areas to support both the future vision of interdependent interoperable systems of systems and a broad range of customer support services e.g., systems of systems integration, enterprise data management, enterprise architecture, technical integration, portfolio management, exercise support, experimentation support, training facility operation, training needs analysis, etc.. The list of required activities are intermixed with processes and products. It is internally inconsistent in its description of activities and their relationships to the functional areas e.g. FEA. As a result the SOW increases complexity in both the IDIQ evaluation process and inhibits the follow-on ability to support DO/TO development and evaluation. Would the government consider rewriting the SOW so that it is much shorter and more expansive in scope? More specifically, eliminating most of the activities in order to focus on providing broadly worded scope for services and product support capabilities. Can the government also address the lifecycle functional areas and the core products areas as well as the emerging and future areas of products and services needed in an environment that demands the analysis, system engineering, acquisition, integration, and support of systems of systems of a mixture of government and commercial products?

No. It is the Government’s position that the SOW and proposal preparation instructions will produce quality proposals which will meet PEO STRI mission needs.

176. Please provide historical metrics indicating the relative importance of tasks that have been issued as Time and Material type contract actions under the previous STOC contract; both as total contract value and a percentage of task orders placed.

The use of T&M type contracts under STOC I was very low relative to the use of other type contracts. As the strategy for STOC II is much different from STOC I, the Government does not recommend using T&M historical data under STOC I as a “predictor” for the type of future contracts it will award under STOC II.

The FAR and applicable regulations provide the Government broad latitude in selecting its methods for evaluating cost/price reasonableness. Given the breadth of potential contracting venues open to the Government under the STOC II IDIQ contract, the Government may select cost/pricing on one or more contract types for evaluation. It has selected the T&M cost/price evaluation approach outlined in the (draft) RFP as the most efficient and effective evaluation methodology, in the best interests of both Government and Industry.

177. We are interested in understanding the likely contract requirements from this solicitation; for both those tasks issued as a Time and Material contract action and those tasks issued as other contract types. Incumbent contractors will have an exceptional understanding of the nature of likely task orders, the relative nature of the tasks, and the likely continuing requirements of the pre-existing tasks. Will the Government establish a reading room or a library repository that may be placed under the contract resulting from this solicitation? This information is critical to insure all potential bidders have an equal opportunity to understand potential tasks and relative value of tasks under this contract.

The following link provides information regarding the current STOC contract:
<https://moss.peostri.army.mil/sites/bop/Contract%20Vehicles/STOC.aspx>

The STOC II Statement of Work provides an indication of work the Government anticipates under this vehicle.

178. The revised draft solicitation greatly expands the labor categories the Government anticipates seeing in the contractor’s response. Although greatly expanded, these labor categories still seem to be structured to represent one encompassing labor category for each broad discipline. The point being the contractor will have to structure their rate proposal for each category to encompass all levels of individuals proposed for the respective labor category. We certainly expect to employ individuals that meet the minimum requirements in each category plus individuals that greatly exceed the minimum requirements. Please provide references to salary survey data for the Orlando, FL area that PEO STRI has deemed acceptable in the past for representative labor categories across professional and administrative job descriptions.

The Government will not provide such data. Providing such data may unintentionally guide Offerors to a specific solution. The Government will not assume responsibility for the correctness of an Offeror’s approach in responding to the RFP and any liabilities that could ensue, post-award.

179. Section B.4 appears to be specific to Contractor Site rates only and the Attachment 6 Cost/Price Worksheet only develops Contractor Site rates. Does the Government anticipate the need for Government Site rates under the anticipated contractor actions(s)?

The Government will address the need for additional labor categories and/or Government site rates at the DO/TO level.

180. Section B.4 states “The Government intends to negotiate rates for the option ordering periods prior to or immediately following exercise of each respective option ordering period.” Although Section B.4 indicates rates for the option periods will not be included in the contract, we are asked on Attachment 6 Cost/Price Worksheet to develop pricing for rates that would encompass the option periods (Contract Years 4-10). What is the purpose of these rates if they will not be included in the resultant contract?

The Offeror shall provide a completed Attachment 6 per the instructions. Offerors are reminded that failure to comply with the requirements may result in the Government deeming their proposal as unresponsive.

181. Reference DFARS Clause 252.245-7001 (May 1994); This clause, entitled “Reports of Government Property,” appears to have been deleted from DFARS, although it did appear in the original (FY00) STOC contracts. Please verify your intention to include this clause; and if so, please provide the clause in full text.

The Government will delete this DFARS clause from the RFP.

182. Pages 47 through 49 provide space for offerors to provide the Time and Material Fully Burdened Labor Rates for Years 1, 2 & 3 of the contract. Below that, there is a fill-in table called “Indirect Rates (Applicable to T&M orders).” In it, there are only spaces to show the Material Handling and G&A rates. Of course, all indirect rates are calculated into the dollar amounts in table B.4. Are these rates applicable to the Material and Other Direct Costs for T&M or are you looking for details about the rates used in creating the fully burdened labor rates?

Offerors are not to fill out RFP pages 47 – 49. Offerors are to complete Attachment 6.

183. Are team member past performances now permitted for submission as part of the past performance Volume? In the earlier version of the pre-RFP, it stated that only the prime contractor should submit past performances. There does not appear to be language to that effect in version 2. Has the prime-only requirement relaxed?

The Government never prohibited the submission of Team member past performance.

184. The page limit for Past Performance is 35 pages. For clarification: Do the Table L-3 parts A thru F consisting of program data, count toward the page limit? If it does, for 5 programs, this leaves only 30 pages for narrative writing, parts G thru L.

Table L-3, A-F is included in the page count.

185. Given that there is no longer a requirement for a Technical Volume and the limited page counts for Volume I and II, is there a requirement to address the contents of the SOW as we would in a Technical Volume or are the Past Performances in Vol I being used to demonstrate technical competence?

No. (See section M.3.2).

186. Section L for the Past Performance Volume includes an outline in a specific “fill-in-the-blanks” format. Is it acceptable to change the format as long as all the information is included?

No. The Government requires that Offerors submit the information in the exact format provided in Table L-3.

187. Is it correct to assume that bidders only need to show capability in one of the core competency areas to be eligible for award with as much chance as a bidder who shows capability in all core competencies (everything else being equal)? If the answer is no please explain.

N/A. See revised Draft RFP.

188. Is it correct to assume that the government does not seek contractor teams; rather you are looking for prime contractors who have the ability to put together a team on a task order basis? If the answer is no, please explain

The Government has attempted to establish solicitation requirements that enable Offerors to bid as stand-alone Primes. However, if an Offeror requires the addition of team members to meet the conditions of the RFP, that is an individual Offeror decision. Also see question #154.

189. If a bidding contractor is significantly smaller than 500 people (say less than 250) will he automatically be placed in the Small Business Set Aside pool regardless of whether or not he submits a Small Business Participation Plan?

No.

190. Is ISO 9000 certification a requirement levied on all bidders?

No.

191. For those engineering processes not required under previous STOC contracts (e.g., IA), is it acceptable to describe our approach to handling these processes in the future in the Management Volume?

Offerors should submit a Management Volume that addresses the requirements of the RFP and best represents their management processes and procedures. The RFP does not restrict Offerors on processes or procedures they elect to address.

192. In section L.3.1., does the statement “The Offeror may use a reduced font size, not less than 8-point, and landscape orientation for Tables and illustrations” refer to the font in the table or illustration, the font in the description below the table or illustration, or both?

Not less than 8-point font only applies to data within tables and illustrations.